

Tragically, however, the Bush administration proposed decreased funding levels for the ARC's nonhighway program by more than 50 percent. Of course, President Bush's friends in the Republican-led House followed through with his wishes by imposing the cuts in appropriations for next year. Now, the administration and the House Republicans say that they want to shift the ARC's nonhighway responsibilities to EDA for larger multijurisdictional projects, diluting the unique attention ARC provides this region of vast potential to serve our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have to be able to express my strong support for the EDA, and I support reauthorization of this vital agency. But, on behalf of West Virginians and all those throughout the Appalachian region, I mourn for the cuts to the ARC.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, October 20, 2003, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2535, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on the motion to go to conference on H.R. 3289.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1245

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 3289 making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, be instructed to insist on the provisions of the Senate bill:

Regarding medical screening for members of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces (Section 317).

Regarding transitional health care and benefits for 180 days from separation for members of the Armed Forces (Sec. 321).

Regarding the provision that \$10,000,000,000 of the amounts provided for the reconstruction of Iraq be in the form of loans, subject to certain conditions (Sec. 2319), and

Regarding the provision of \$1,300,000,000 to the Veterans Health Administration for medical care for Veterans (Title IV).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to go to conference on a bill which spends \$87 billion. It is the second installment of what will be many installment payments to deal with the consequences of the war in Iraq. This motion to instruct attempts to put the House on record in favor of three provisions which the Senate passed earlier last week.

First, with respect to the issue of loans versus grants, this motion would provide that after \$5.1 billion is set aside for military and security operations, and after \$5.1 billion is set aside for Ambassador Bremer to deal with other costs associated with the effort in Iraq, that the remaining \$10 billion of the reconstruction portion of the package be provided in the form of a loan, unless the President certifies that 90 percent of the bilateral debt owed by Iraq to other countries is forgiven.

The purpose of this first provision is to recognize that, over the next 5 years, the per capita foreign debt of the United States will be larger than is the per capita debt of Iraq, and since foreign debts can only be paid off by a country running trade surpluses, that means that, in effect, over the next 5 years Iraq will be in a better position to repay their foreign debts than we will be.

Secondly, we ask the House to go on record in support of two provisions that relate to quality-of-life measures for our troops. The first is to provide

medical screening and dental screening for Guard and Reserve personnel prior to their being mobilized; and, second, to extend the transitional health care coverage to servicemembers who have been on active duty in Iraq and are now returning home, to extend that transitional health care coverage from the existing 60 days to 180 days. Certainly, that is the least we can do for these returning servicemen and women.

Thirdly, we ask the House to go on record in support of \$1.3 billion in additional funds for veterans health care so that Priority 7 and Priority 8 veterans can make better use of veterans health care facilities without having to pay a \$250 deductible and without seeing the cost of their prescriptions virtually doubled. This is, in essence, the content of the Bond-Mikulski amendment adopted in the other body.

That is what this does, and I would ask Members to support it.

I would also ask that if they do support it, they recognize that they have an obligation to then insist that these provisions be contained in the conference report, because they are already in the Senate bill. As Members know, conference committees are supposed to deal only with those matters which are in dispute between the two bodies. So I would urge any veteran or any other interested American citizen watching this debate to keep close track of how Members vote today, and compare that vote with how they vote when this conference report comes back. I think in that way it will in effect mean that they will be acting as a "hypocrisy detector," which is always good for this body, when someone is looking over our shoulders.

I want to say one other thing. I know that the President of the United States is a powerful man. I know that in this town he is probably the biggest man on campus that you can find. But the fact is that I have never yet met a White House who did not think that Article I of the Constitution was a drafting error by the Founding Fathers. And I think that we need to remind all Presidents that we represent the same citizens that they do. We owe every President our respect, we owe every President a respectful hearing, but he also owes us the same thing, and that means that we need to work with each other.

Checks and balances: Mr. Speaker, in my view checks and balances is not simply an ornamental concept of democracy; it is a core element. It is the heart of our democratic system, and we have a right to expect the same respectful hearing from the President if we have an opinion that differs from his, as we have an obligation to give his views a respectful hearing.

But I note in today's article by E.J. Dionne in the Washington Post that the President, in a meeting last week, appears to have provided something other than that respectful hearing to Members of Congress.

Now, I know that the President is a business school graduate of a distinguished university, and I know that he regards himself in many ways as being an MBA President. He wants to bring business practices to the White House. Fine. But I would say that if that is the case, then even under the model that he sees, that means we are the Board of Directors.

We owe it to the country, it seems to me, to approach issues like this with great deliberation and great care. When we rubber-stamp the desires of any President, we, in essence, do not behave like the greatest deliberative body in the world; we behave instead like a poor imitation of the Board of Directors at Enron.

I do not think we ought to do that. Yet I notice in Mr. Dionne's column of today, he is describing a discussion that took place at the White House between the President and a number of Senators, and he is quoted by one Senator as saying, "I'm here to tell you that this is what we have to do and this is how we have to do it," one Senator quoted the President as saying.

Then that Senator went on to say that after she had asked a question of the President, "He looked at me and said, 'it is not negotiable, and I don't want to debate it.'"

Now, I would suggest that that might be a proper attitude if a parent is dealing with a minor child. It is not a proper approach when we are dealing with co-equal branches of government.

So I ask every Member today to use their own judgment and think through what they think is in the best interests not just of this country, but of the Guard and Reserve forces who we are asking to fight our battles over in Iraq and our veterans who have done their duty and who are looking for some help with health care problems that they incur along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge support for the motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, motions to instruct are usually a very strong tool of the minority party, and the reason I know that is because we were in the minority for a lot of years. As a matter of fact, one party controlled the House of Representatives for 40 years without a break. During that time, the minority party, our party, used a lot of motions to instruct. Most of these never passed, because the majority party has to manage and has to function and pass bills. So motions to instruct, although they are not binding, still seem to carry weight in the conference meeting. We need to move this conference quickly.

After lengthy debate in the House on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of last week, and for nearly 2 weeks in the Senate, a lot of debate on amendments took place. Some amendments were agreed to; some amendments were adopted, and some were defeated.

Two of the amendments we dealt with seriously through most of the de-

bate had to do with loans to Iraq. As we all know, the House spoke rather emphatically that loans are not the way we were going to proceed. One problem is there is no government in Iraq to whom we would make a loan. Our own laws require that there be a government established before we can make a loan to a country.

But what we are dealing with primarily, is to finish the job that was started in Iraq; and, when we finish the job, that means bringing our troops home. In order to bring our troops home, we are going to have to complete what they set out to do.

Saddam is gone, his regime is gone, but we cannot guarantee that another Saddam will not arise from the ashes of Baghdad if we do not help the Iraqi people establish a government, if we do not help the Iraqi people establish a health system, if we do not help the Iraqi people establish an educational system, and we are doing very well on the educational system. The health system is ongoing, and we are providing additional money in the supplemental to provide additional health systems.

We need to rebuild the infrastructure, electrical generation and distribution to people of Iraq, and to create a security force, where the people themselves can own their government, control their government, and not have to worry about a dictatorial regime raising its ugly head. When that happens, we can bring our troops home. The safety of our troops and the bringing of our troops home is important to me.

I do not know that this motion to instruct would actually delay the process, but it could. This should be understood, although most of the debate has been about the construction funds and the reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan, most of the money in the bill supports our own troops. It provides them with more adequate drinking water and potable water facilities. We have spoken strongly on several occasions, and we speak strongly again in this bill, that no American soldier should be in Iraq or any other place of hostility without body armor. In addition, having armor on the Humvees and the military vehicles that are not armored today, also needs to be done for the protection of our troops.

□ 1300

So we need to get this country stabilized and get our troops back home so that they do not have to be deployed constantly, not only our active duty troops but our Guard and Reserves.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has put together a pretty interesting motion to instruct. I would have to tell him that I like a lot of the things he has put in there, but there is one thing that we are not going to agree to: the conferees will not agree to this loan provision.

The President has spoken strongly on loans numerous times. The House has

spoken strongly on it. And for those who think that the Senate is opposed to doing it like the House did, understand that the Senate already included \$10 billion in their bill as a grant to the construction of Iraq and Afghanistan. And so the Senate is not opposed to doing it this way. They just have a little different arrangement.

So I am going to vote against this motion to instruct primarily because of the provision dealing with loans to Iraq, which the President feels very strongly about. And in the statement of the administration's position, the director of OMB has said specifically that the President's leadership, his top leaders and advisors, would advise for a veto if that loan provision stayed in the bill.

So I am going to vote against this because I am not sure that motions to instruct have ever had any influence whatsoever, as they are not binding. But for any Members on our side who feel that this is something they should vote for to have a symbolic vote, I will have no problem with that. And I am not going to ask the House to defeat this motion. I am just going to say that for the reasons that I mentioned I am going to vote against it and primarily because I am not going to agree in conference to the loan provision. I am going to support the President's position on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees today to add \$1.3 billion to the supplemental for veterans health care. This motion to instruct offered by Mr. OBEY recognizes caring for our veterans is a continuing constant war.

Last week, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs heard testimony from four veterans who spoke about the terrible injuries they and their families sustained in combat in the global war on terrorism. The costs of caring for these veterans, 2,000 who have used VA to date and hundreds of thousands more who will be eligible for VA health care when they return to the United States, all should be considered part of the cost of this war.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion. Let us not let our veterans down with a budget that will not meet the needs of returning troops or those it currently serves.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I went to the Committee on Rules during its consideration of the supplemental request for Iraq in order to seek protection for an amendment to transfer 1.8 billion to our veterans when it came from the Iraqi reconstruction to

veterans health care. My amendment was not protected, thus not found to be in order. So I greatly appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for offering this motion, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

I would consider this vote, if you look at additional monies that the Senate has allocated for our veterans at this time, if today, like many other days since Operation Iraqi Freedom began, wounded troops will continue to arrive at Walter Reed Army Hospital and other military facilities on an average of 10 each day, 10 veterans who need services and who need assistance.

The military lists thousands, in fact, close to 1,600 now, that have been injured, have lost their limbs. Thousands more may come to our veterans hospitals in search of medical care for the conditions that may become evident in days and months after their military service has ended.

This summer the House broke its promise with our veterans. Our budget resolution promised to add \$1.8 billion for veterans, yet the appropriations we approved for the VA added nothing. We have another chance to correct that situation. We have a chance to do the right thing for our veterans. We have asked them to go to Afghanistan; we have asked them to go to Iraq. And they have been willing, but we have to be there for them when they come back home.

This money will allow the military to provide better equipment and supplies to men and women who also have volunteered to defend our country. We also need to recognize that these veterans, this additional resource is not money that is above and beyond; it is for existing services. So it becomes important that we do the right thing. We ask that you support the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on this motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct conferees. Let me note I support our President in his military requests for Iraq, and I applaud his leadership and the great job that our military has done in Iraq.

The question is not the \$66 billion that we are providing in the supplemental for our military, but the \$18.6 billion in reconstruction money. And the question is should we just give this as a grant or should half of that \$18.6 billion, at least half of it, be in the form of a loan that will be repaid after 20 years.

Well, I do not see any reason why after bearing such a heavy burden, it is not like the \$66 billion, but so many other billions of dollars, why the American people have to carry the whole burden. Why do we not permit half of this, \$10 billion of this, to go in the

form of a loan that can be repaid? After all, we are in debt \$400 billion a year. That is our level of deficit spending. We have to borrow that \$10 billion to give it to Iraq as a gift. Why do we not let them repay it after 20 years, put it in the form of a loan? That way our children will not have to repay this \$10 billion 20 years from now. Instead, Iraqi children, who will have benefited from all of our investment and will probably be the richest kids in the world because Iraq is one of the richest oil producing country's in the world, let them pay it back.

Mr. Speaker, I would support this motion to instruct. Let us give the American people a little break.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The gentleman has 16½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this clearly is a better bill than we received from the White House. It specifies that money has to be used for Kevlar jackets, for example, for the jamming devices. There is no question but that there are improvements.

What this instruction would do is to improve those improvements so that this is a bill that is far more in keeping with what our constituents would like to see. I have no question about that. I know that from the perspective of Americans who want to protect our troops overseas, and from the perspective of taxpayers, they would want this entire body to support this instruction to the conferees. Because that is what it is about, troops and taxpayers.

First of all, the troops. It provides the kind of quality-of-life improvements that every single one of our constituents would want us to include in this bill. Every single one. I would challenge any Member on the Republican or the Democratic side of the aisle to show me one constituent who would not want us to have these improvements in this supplemental appropriations bill.

And then from the standpoint of taxpayers, I have yet to find anyone of any political persuasion that does not think when you sit down with them privately that we should not be fronting all this money as grants when Iraq could conceivably be one of the wealthiest countries in the world, has potentially \$7 trillion of oil reserves, when the money that we are talking about, which is always used as the excuse for why it has to be a grant, why it cannot be a loan because they have got \$200 billion of outstanding debt.

Who does Iraq owe that money to? Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Russia, France, some to Germany. How was that money spent? A whole lot of it was spent to build the palaces. Some we know was taken by Saddam and his henchmen. That is the way all of that works, that corruption is pervasive.

And why those countries that were dealing with Saddam should be first in

line before the American taxpayer is beyond me and beyond every single one of our constituents.

That is why the Senate put this provision in the bill. We know our constituents want the provision in the bill. I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wants the provision in the bill. I know I cannot speak and I should not be speaking for him, but he is doing what the White House has asked us to. I am saying we have already told the White House we can fashion a better bill. This fashions an even better bill, one much more consistent with what our constituents would want us to do.

Mr. Speaker, vote in the interest of the troops and the taxpayers; approve this motion to instruct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the ranking Democrat on the Military Construction Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to be making promises to Iraqis while breaking promises to America's veterans. It is wrong to say Americans can afford to build new hospitals in Baghdad, but we cannot afford to keep open veterans hospitals here at home.

This motion is about doing right by America's veterans, veterans such as Robert Armstrong. I met this brave American, a constituent of mine, recently at Walter Reed Army Hospital. Sergeant Armstrong was protecting a children's medical center in Baghdad when a grenade went off close by. He was badly wounded and near death. Army doctors were so sure that he would die that they ushered him out of the Army in order to help his family receive higher death benefits.

But Sergeant Armstrong did not die even though his heart flatlined five times and he lost an eye and a leg. In and out of consciousness, Sergeant Armstrong kept repeating the name Mary, Mary, Mary. It turns out that Mary was his 15-year-old daughter, and he had promised her he would come home alive.

My wife was with Mary at Walter Reed Hospital when she saw her loving father for the first time in 5 months. His first words to his daughter were, "Mary, I always keep my promises." Mr. Speaker, this motion is about America saying to Sergeant Armstrong that we will keep our promise to you, the promise to provide you with quality health care because of your service and sacrifices for our Nation.

The truth is the proposed VA health care budget does not even keep up with inflation, even during the time of war. It would require cuts in services that are already stretched to the limit.

□ 1315

It is \$1.8 billion below the VA health care budget promised by Republicans in this House earlier this year in their budget resolution. The Senate provides \$1.3 billion more than the House bill,

coming much closer to keeping our promise to veterans. And we should support that higher level of funding for our veterans hospitals and we know it. Our veterans deserve no less.

Sergeant Armstrong kept his promise to his daughter. Now, it is time for America to keep our promise to him. Let us, in a bipartisan fashion, support this motion to instruct. Let us, on a bipartisan basis, vote to increase funding for veterans hospitals by \$1.3 billion and then let us mean it, because to vote for this resolution and then not to push it through conference committee would be breaking a promise to our veterans one more time. They deserve better than that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 10½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion, and I hope that everybody on both sides of the aisle will take it seriously. This issue was debated in the House and our effort was turned down. It was also debated in the Senate and the issue of a loan was thoroughly examined and the Senate voted in favor of this approach.

In the Senate, even more so in the House, we heard all the arguments against it, that there is no government to sign it. They already have a debt. It would make it clear that we were interested in oil from the beginning. That is one of the arguments that is given and also that it would diminish efforts from others. But I think these arguments were effectively answered within the Senate.

There is a governing council, an entity that is now working. It is hard to believe that in the next months, if we do our job well and we get some help from others, that they would not be in a position to handle this issue. As to their already having a debt, it is possible, I think, for a loan to be put together to take that into account and remember the Senate version.

The Senate version would trigger an event if other nations forgave their debt. In terms of participation of others, I do not see how this would affect it. What this would bring about if adopted would be that the Senate would be encouraged to persist in their approach. And the reason to consider this is it could be amended, perhaps somewhat differently than the Senate put it together, but it would still be there. There would be participation more fully by the Iraqis. They would have greater investment in their own future. And also they would share the cost of this with the American public.

So I urge that there be support for this motion. This loan provision needs to be continued in terms of discussion

and not simply thrown aside by an administration that has been headstrong from the very beginning. We should not allow it to be headstrong about this loan provision.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, who has the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has the right to close.

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) have any other speakers?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, since I have the right to close, I will let the gentleman proceed. I have only one speaker.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in my opening comments, the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) motion has a lot of things to feel good about. The conference on the authorization committee for the Committee on Armed Services is working on a lot of these details already that the House is supporting.

We have done a number of good things for quality of life for our military. To listen to some of the speakers on the other side, you would think we had done nothing for the members of our military. That is just not true. That is a little misleading, but then we know in debate, things get a little misleading. We provided hazard pay and separation allowances and fully funded them in this bill. We have authorized travel assistance for military families, that is, continued payment of per diem for travel of family members of our military personnel who are ill or injured as a result of active duty service.

Clothing allowances. We provided the Department of Defense authority to provide monetary stipends to soldiers to purchase civilian clothing to wear during their hospital stays.

Meal allowances. The House has moved on three separate occasions and moved very quickly to abolish the outrageous system of soldiers in military hospitals being billed for the food that they consume while they are recovering from the wounds on the battlefield. Outrageous.

The House moved quickly on three different occasions to not only repeal that law but to make it retroactive through September 11, 2001 and to provide for repayment of any of those bills that had already been collected from wounded military personnel. We are going to pay them back. The House has moved very quickly on that. And I thank the House again, because we made it retroactive here when I offered an amendment for myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to not only make that repeal permanent, but to actually make it retroactive until September 11.

We have directed the Department of Defense to increase the availability of modern hydration systems for the sol-

diers in Iraq. It gets really hot there, and the soldiers need as much water hydration as they can get, and we insist on that being provided. We took the President's request; we made some changes. I think we produced an even better bill than the President requested. We have a good bill that was passed by the House after debating for 3 days, and I do not want to do anything to limit our ability to advance this important bill, and to have some flexibility in the conference. It is the same thing that they wanted when they were in the majority party, they wanted flexibility to negotiate with the other body and we do too.

As I have said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask my side of the aisle to defeat this motion to recommit and this motion to instruct. It is non-binding, and it has a lot of good-sounding symbolic items. I am going to vote against it myself, because I cannot agree to the provision that talks about the loan provision that the Senate included that the House defeated on two separate occasions. So I will be there to defend the position of the House and to negotiate with the other body to get the best bill that we can and one that will not be vetoed. And it has been suggested that it could be subject to a veto if that loan provision remains in the bill.

So other than that, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can get about our business. We would like to get to conference quickly on this bill. We would like to be able to conclude a conference early next week and have this bill to the President as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this motion has nothing to do with the question of whether the troops will come home sooner or not; but it has a whole lot to do with how we will treat those troops before they go to Iraq and after they return home. That is why we provide in this motion that the House ought to accept the Senate provision providing for premobilization health care and dental screening for Guard and Reserve forces and why we extend health coverage, the military health coverage to them for 4 additional months after they return home, above and beyond that to which they now are entitled.

This amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with making it harder for Iraq to repay its debts. In fact, this provision has a huge incentive for all other countries in the world to forgive their debts, just as they did with Poland when Poland became a democracy. Because this says that 50 percent of the reconstruction money to Iraq will be in the form of a loan unless the rest of the world forgives their debts. And then if the rest of the world forgives their debts, then we will too.

If we are looking for a way to put Iraq in the strongest possible position and to make sure that Uncle Sam's

taxpayers are not the only ones stuck with the bad deal, you need to vote for this amendment.

I would also say that we have heard the argument that somehow this proposal might slow down consideration of the bill; just the opposite. All this motion does is to accept three items that the Senate has already agreed to. The Senate has already determined that half of the reconstruction funds ought to be in the form of loans. The Senate has already determined that we ought to provide the additional health care to our military personnel that I have just described. The Senate has already determined that veterans deserve the additional \$1.3 billion in veterans health care that we are trying to provide. So all we are doing is narrowing the differences between the two Chambers, which ought to make it faster in terms of the time it takes to deal with there bill.

I do hope, however, that particularly veterans groups, I hope veterans groups will put out a very large "Beware" sign on this vote, Mr. Speaker, because I am afraid that there will be a number of Members who will vote for this motion in the belief that it is merely symbolic, fully intending to support efforts by the Senate and House Republican leadership to then jettison these provisions as soon as they get to conference. That would be the ultimate act of insincerity.

And I hope that veterans groups will not let Members of this House pose for political holy pictures on this vote and then bug out of their responsibilities to stick to that vote when the bill goes to conference and comes back from conference.

I also would like to say one other thing. The President, as I said earlier, deserves the respect of every Member of this House, if for no other reason than by virtue of the office that he holds. But I want to say that the President is our leader; he is not a one-man band.

This Congress has an obligation also to weigh in with its own best judgments. I think this President, rather than telling Members of Congress that items like this are nonnegotiable, I think, as teachers often say to parents, he needs to learn to "work well with others". And I think that applies to how well he needs to be able to work with the Congress, and I think it also applies to how well he needs to work with our allies. And I would hope that, I would hope that that would happen.

After all, this is the same administration that did not provide the needed Kevlar linings for body armor for over 40,000 American troops.

This is the same administration that did not provide enough jammers, electronic jammers, to our troops in Iraq. And as a consequence, we have had American servicemen and women killed or maimed because they could not prevent the remote detonation of bombs and mines.

This is, after all, the same administration that did not see to it that we

had enough armor for the Humvees so that they would not be vulnerable to explosions from the roadbed.

And this is the same administration that asked for so little money for clean water for our troops that 80 percent of our troops in Iraq, right now, are still drinking putrid water.

□ 1330

So I would say, with all due respect, no one is perfect. This administration certainly does not have a monopoly on wisdom. Neither do we on this end of Capitol Hill; but we ought to be able to work together in an effort to reach reasonable compromises. I think this recommit motion is, in fact, an effort at a reasonable compromise; and with that, I would ask for an "aye" vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the question of passage of H.J. Res. 73.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 139, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

YEAS—277

Abercrombie	Burton (IN)	Dicks
Ackerman	Capito	Dingell
Aderholt	Capps	Dooley (CA)
Alexander	Capuano	Doyle
Allen	Cardin	Duncan
Baca	Cardoza	Dunn
Bachus	Carson (IN)	Edwards
Baird	Carson (OK)	Emanuel
Baldwin	Chabot	Engel
Ballenger	Clay	Eshoo
Bartlett (MD)	Clyburn	Etheridge
Becerra	Conyers	Evans
Bell	Cooper	Everett
Berkley	Costello	Farr
Berman	Cramer	Fattah
Berry	Crowley	Ferguson
Bilirakis	Cubin	Filner
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Foley
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Forbes
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Ford
Blumenauer	Davis (FL)	Frank (MA)
Bono	Davis (IL)	Franks (AZ)
Boswell	Davis (TN)	Frost
Boucher	Davis, Jo Ann	Garrett (NJ)
Boyd	Deal (GA)	Gerlach
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Gillmor
Brown (OH)	DeGette	Gonzalez
Brown, Corrine	Delahunt	Goode
Brown-Waite,	DeLauro	Gordon
Ginny	Deutsch	Graves
Burns	Diaz-Balart, L.	Green (TX)
Burr	Diaz-Balart, M.	Grijalva

Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)	Ruppersberger
Gutknecht	McCollum	Rush
Hall	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
Harman	McGovern	Ryun (KS)
Hastings (FL)	McInnis	Sabo
Hayworth	McIntyre	Sanchez, Linda
Hefley	McNulty	T.
Hill	Meehan	Sanders
Hinchey	Meek (FL)	Sandlin
Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)	Saxton
Hoeffel	Menendez	Schakowsky
Holden	Mica	Schiff
Holt	Michaud	Scott (GA)
Honda	Millender-	Scott (VA)
Hooley (OR)	McDonald	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Shaw
Hulshof	Miller, George	Shays
Inslie	Mollohan	Sherman
Israel	Moore	Shuster
Jackson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Skelton
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Smith (MI)
(TX)	Murphy	Smith (NJ)
Janklow	Musgrave	Smith (WA)
Jefferson	Myrick	Snyder
Jenkins	Nadler	Solis
John	Napolitano	Spratt
Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Stark
Jones (NC)	Ney	Stearns
Jones (OH)	Norwood	Stenholm
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Strickland
Kaptur	Obey	Stupak
Keller	Olver	Tancred
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Tanner
Kildee	Ose	Tauscher
Kilpatrick	Owens	Tauzin
Kind	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Klecza	Pascarell	Taylor (NC)
Lampson	Pastor	Terry
Langevin	Paul	Thompson (CA)
Lantos	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Tierney
Larson (CT)	Pence	Towns
LaTourette	Peterson (MN)	Turner (TX)
Leach	Peterson (PA)	Udall (CO)
Lee	Petri	Udall (NM)
Levin	Platts	Upton
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Van Hollen
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Velazquez
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Rahall	Wamp
Lofgren	Rangel	Waters
Lowey	Rehberg	Watt
Lucas (KY)	Renzi	Waxman
Lynch	Rodriguez	Weiner
Majette	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (PA)
Maloney	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (NM)
Markey	Ross	Woolsey
Matheson	Rothman	Wu
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Wynn
McCarthy (MO)	Royce	

NAYS—139

Akin	DeLay	Johnson, Sam
Baker	DeMint	Kennedy (MN)
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	King (IA)
Barton (TX)	Dreier	King (NY)
Bass	Ehlers	Kingston
Beauprez	Emerson	Kirk
Bereuter	English	Kline
Biggart	Feeney	Knollenberg
Bishop (UT)	Flake	Kolbe
Blunt	Fossella	Kucinich
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Boehner	Gibbons	Latham
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Gingrey	Linder
Boozman	Goodlatte	Lucas (OK)
Bradley (NH)	Goss	McCotter
Brady (TX)	Granger	McCrery
Brown (SC)	Green (WI)	McHugh
Burgess	Greenwood	McKeon
Buyer	Harris	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Hart	Miller, Gary
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Murtha
Cannon	Hayes	Nethercutt
Cantor	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Carter	Herger	Northup
Castle	Hobson	Nunes
Chocola	Hoekstra	Nussle
Cole	Houghton	Osborne
Collins	Hunter	Otter
Cox	Hyde	Oxley
Crane	Isakson	Pearce
Crenshaw	Issa	Pickering
Culberson	Istook	Pitts
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Pombo
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Portman

Pryce (OH)	Shimkus	Turner (OH)
Putnam	Simpson	Walden (OR)
Quinn	Simpson	Walsh
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Reynolds	Souder	Weller
Rogers (KY)	Sullivan	Wicker
Rogers (MI)	Sweeney	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (WI)	Thomas	Wolf
Schrock	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Sessions	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Shadegg	Tiberi	
Sherwood	Toomey	

## NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	Gallegly	Reyes
Ballance	Gephardt	Sanchez, Loretta
Case	Kelly	Slaughter
Coble	Marshall	Vitter
Doggett	Ramstad	Watson
Fletcher	Regula	Wexler

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1354

Messrs. NUNES, YOUNG of Alaska, HOBSON, BASS, CHOCOLA, ISSA, COLE, and FRELINGHUYSEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KELLER, TANCREDO, ROGERS of Alabama, GRAVES, BALLENGER, NORWOOD, BACHUS, MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, HEFLEY, BARTLETT of Maryland, DICKS, SKELTON, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, SHAYS, and Mrs. CUBIN and Ms. DUNN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently did not vote on the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3289, Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY04. This motion directs conferees to keep the Senate-adopted language to: convert half of the Iraq rebuilding funds into a loan provided 90 percent of Iraq's bilateral debts are forgiven; provide quality of life improvements for our troops; and provide \$1.3 billion in emergency funds for veterans' health care.

Had I been present, on rollcall Vote No. 567, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 21, I was unavoidably detained and missed a recorded vote number 567 on a motion to instruct conferees for H.R. 3289, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for FY 2004. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of passage of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 73, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 19, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 568]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie	DeLay	Johnson (CT)
Ackerman	DeMint	Johnson (IL)
Aderholt	Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.
Akin	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jones (NC)
Allen	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Baca	Dingell	Kanjorski
Bachus	Dooley (CA)	Kaptur
Baird	Doolittle	Keller
Baker	Doyle	Kennedy (MN)
Baldwin	Dreier	Kennedy (RI)
Ballance	Duncan	Kildee
Ballenger	Dunn	Kilpatrick
Barrett (SC)	Edwards	Kind
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	King (IA)
Barton (TX)	Emanuel	King (NY)
Bass	Emerson	Kingston
Beauprez	Engel	Kirk
Bell	English	Klecza
Bereuter	Eshoo	Kline
Berkley	Etheridge	Knollenberg
Berman	Evans	Kolbe
Berry	Everett	LaHood
Biggett	Farr	Lampson
Billirakis	Fattah	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Feeney	Lantos
Bishop (NY)	Ferguson	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Flake	Larson (CT)
Blackburn	Foley	Latham
Blunt	Forbes	LaTourette
Boehlert	Ford	Leach
Boehner	Fossella	Levin
Bonilla	Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (GA)
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Boozman	Frost	Linder
Boswell	Garrett (NJ)	Lipinski
Boucher	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Boyd	Gibbons	Lofgren
Bradley (NH)	Gilchrest	Lowe
Brady (PA)	Gillmor	Lucas (KY)
Brady (TX)	Gingrey	Lucas (OK)
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Lynch
Brown (SC)	Goode	Majette
Brown, Corrine	Goodlatte	Maloney
Brown-Waite,	Gordon	Manzullo
Ginny	Goss	Markey
Burgess	Granger	Matheson
Burns	Graves	Matsui
Burr	Green (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	McCarthy (NY)
Buyer	Greenwood	McCollum
Calvert	Grijalva	McCotter
Camp	Gutierrez	McCrery
Cannon	Gutknecht	McGovern
Cantor	Hall	McHugh
Capito	Harman	McInnis
Capps	Harris	McIntyre
Cardin	Hart	McKeon
Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Carson (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Carson (OK)	Hayes	Meek (FL)
Carter	Hayworth	Meeks (NY)
Castle	Hefley	Menendez
Chabot	Hensarling	Mica
Chocola	Herger	Michaud
Clay	Hill	Millender-
Clyburn	Hinche	McDonald
Cole	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hobson	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Hoeffel	Miller (NC)
Costello	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Cox	Holden	Mollohan
Cramer	Honda	Moore
Crane	Hooley (OR)	Moran (KS)
Crenshaw	Hostettler	Moran (VA)
Crowley	Houghton	Murphy
Cubin	Hoyer	Murtha
Culberson	Hulshof	Musgrave
Cummings	Hunter	Myrick
Cunningham	Hyde	Nadler
Davis (AL)	Inslee	Napolitano
Davis (FL)	Isakson	Neal (MA)
Davis (IL)	Israel	Nethercutt
Davis (TN)	Issa	Neugebauer
Davis, Jo Ann	Istook	Ney
Davis, Tom	Jackson (IL)	Northup
Deal (GA)	Janklow	Norwood
DeGette	Jefferson	Nunes
DeLaunt	Jenkins	Nussle
DeLauro	John	Oberstar

Obeys	Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Ortiz	Royce	Tauzin
Osborne	Ruppersberger	Taylor (MS)
Ose	Ryan (OH)	Taylor (NC)
Otter	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Owens	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Oxley	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Pallone	Sanders	Thompson (MS)
Pascarell	Sandlin	Thornberry
Pastor	Saxton	Tiahrt
Payne	Schakowsky	Tiberi
Pearce	Schiff	Toomey
Pelosi	Schrock	Towns
Pence	Scott (GA)	Turner (OH)
Peterson (MN)	Scott (VA)	Turner (TX)
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Udall (CO)
Petri	Serrano	Udall (NM)
Pickering	Sessions	Upton
Pitts	Shadegg	Van Hollen
Platts	Shaw	Velazquez
Pombo	Shays	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Sherman	Walden (OR)
Porter	Sherwood	Walsh
Portman	Shimkus	Wamp
Price (NC)	Shuster	Waters
Pryce (OH)	Simmons	Watson
Putnam	Simpson	Watt
Quinn	Skelton	Waxman
Radanovich	Smith (MI)	Weiner
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (FL)
Rangel	Smith (TX)	Weldon (PA)
Rehberg	Smith (WA)	Weller
Renzi	Snyder	Whitfield
Reynolds	Solis	Wicker
Rodriguez	Souder	Wilson (NM)
Rogers (AL)	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Stearns	Wolf
Rogers (MI)	Stenholm	Woolsey
Rohrabacher	Strickland	Wu
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Wynn
Ross	Sullivan	Young (AK)
Rothman	Sweeney	Young (FL)

## NAYS—19

Becerra	Jackson-Lee	Paul
Blumenauer	(TX)	Sanchez, Linda
Capuano	Kucinich	T.
Davis (CA)	Lee	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Tancredo
Filner	Miller, George	Tauscher
Holt	Olver	Tierney

## NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	Gallegly	Reyes
Case	Gephardt	Rush
Coble	Kelly	Sanchez, Loretta
Collins	Marshall	Slaughter
Doggett	Ramstad	Vitter
Fletcher	Regula	Wexler

□ 1402

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3289, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN, 2004

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, LEWIS of California, ROGERS of Kentucky, WOLF, KOLBE, WALSH, KNOLLENBERG, OBEY, MURTHA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. EDWARDS.

There was no objection.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2821

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2821.